

and radially injecting said stream of ozone-containing gas into said stream of cellulose pulp so as to provide a stream of bleached cellulose pulp, whereby said cellulose pulp may be bleached without the use of a high-sheer mixer.

REMARKS

Claims 7-13 were pending in the present application. Claim 7 was amended to correct informalities and the amendment to claim 7 does not raise any issue of new matter. Therefore, entry of this Amendment is respectfully requested. Upon entry of the present Amendment claims 7-13 will be under examination.

CLAIM REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 7-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Bentvelzen et al., U.S. Patent No. 4,295,927 ("Bentvelzen") in view of page 4, lines, 15-24 of the specification or AT 403 704 or Sixta et al.

Applicants respectfully disagree with the Office Action's characterization of the prior art references. Specifically, Applicants submit that page 4, lines 15-24 of the specification is part of the summary of the invention, not "admitted prior art".

Moreover, AT 403 704 only discloses the use of ozone at low concentration. Figure 2 of AT 403 704 shows the use of 12% ozone by weight. Furthermore, Sixta et al. discloses, in example 1, the use of ozone at a concentration of 76.8 mg per liter, which is equivalent to about 5.4% of ozone by weight and requires the use of high sheer mixer. Other examples of Sixta et al. also show the use of low ozone concentration with high shear mixer.

In addition, the primary reference, Bentvelzen, discloses the use of a mixer and a storage tank as a reactor. The mixer of Bentvelzen has divided gas entry which can only be used effectively in the Bentvelzen process. To the contrary, the ozone process demands entry of gas mixture at one entry point with no recycle. The present invention, however, does not require the use of a storage tank. Applicants contend that the combination of Bentvelzen et al., page 4, lines 15-24 of the specification, AT 403 704 and Sixta et al. does not teach or suggest the subject matter of claims 7-12, as amended, as the combination does not teach or suggest each and every element of claims 7-12 under the standard of MPEP §2142. Therefore, claims 7-12 are nonobvious over the combination of Bentvelzen et al., page 4, lines 15-24 of the specification, AT 403 704 and Sixta et al. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this ground of rejection are respectfully requested.

CLAIM REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 13 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Bentvelzen et al. in view of page 4, lines 15-24 of the specification or AT 403 704 or Sixta et al. as applied to claim 7 above, and further in view of Cheng.

For the same reason as stated in applicants' response to the obviousness rejection of claims 7-12, claim 13 is also nonobvious over the combination of Bentvelzen et al., page 4, line 15-24 of the specification or AT 403 704 or Sixta et al. and Cheng as the combination does not teach or suggest each and every element of claim 13. Therefore, claim 13 is nonobvious over the combination of Bentvelzen et al., page 4, line 15-24 of the specification or AT 403 704 or Sixta et al. and Cheng. Accordingly, consideration and withdrawal of this ground of rejection are respectfully requested.

CLAIM REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §112, SECOND PARAGRAPH

Claims 7-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants' regard as the invention. Specifically, the Office Action objects to the use of the term "from pressurized oxygen".

Applicants have amended claim 7 to replace the term "from pressurized oxygen" to "formed from pressurized oxygen". Applicants' respectfully submit that the amendment to claim 7 overcome this ground of rejection. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of these grounds of rejection are respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the amendment and remarks, further and favorable consideration of claims 7-13 and the issuance of a Notice of Allowance with respect to these claims are earnestly solicited.

If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that he telephone applicant's attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional objections which he might have.

No fee is deemed necessary in connection with the filing of this Amendment. However, if any fee is required, the Examiner is authorized to charge any such fee to our Deposit Account No. 12-1095.

Dated: March 25, 2002

Respectfully submitted,

By *Lance Y. Liu*
Lance Y. Liu
Registration No.: 45,379
LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,
KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP
600 South Avenue West
Westfield, New Jersey 07090
(908) 654-5000
Attorneys for Applicant

359474_1.DOC